Entered on Docket October 4, 2012

Below is the Order of the Court.

Marc Barreca
U.S. Bankruptcy Judge
(Dated as of Entered on Docket date above)

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

In re **Adam R. Grossman,** Debtor.	Bankruptcy Case No. **10-19817-MLB** **ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION (DKT. NO. 433) OF ORDER DISALLOWING CLAIMS 20-33 (DKT. NO. 423)**

This matter came before the Court on Debtor's "Ex Parte Motion for Entry of Orders for Relief from Judgments or Orders Re: Docket No. 423 Order Disallowing Claims," which the Court construed as a motion for reconsideration (the "Motion for Reconsideration," Dkt. No. 433) of this Court's Order Disallowing Claims 20-33 (the "Order Disallowing Claims," Dkt. No. 423).[1]

The Court considered the pleadings and files herein pursuant to Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure ("FRBP") 8002(b) and 9023, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure (Fed. R. Civ. P.") 59(e), Local Bankruptcy Rule for the Western District of Washington ("Local Rule") 9013-1(h) and Local Civil Rule for the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington ("Civil Rule") 7(h).[2]

Standard for Reconsideration

"The Bankruptcy Code does not contemplate motions for reconsideration; rather such motions are treated as motions to alter or amend judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e), made applicable by Bankruptcy Rule 9023." *In re Ball*, 2008 Bankr. LEXIS 4745, at *19 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2008) (unpublished); *see also In re America West Airlines*, 240 B.R. 34 , 38 (Bankr. D. Ariz. 1999). Local Rule 9013-1(h) provides that Civil Rule 7(h) governs motions for reconsideration. Civil Rule 7(h) provides that:

> Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.

Local Rules, W.D. Wash. CR 7(h).

Analysis

Debtor has not demonstrated manifest error in the Court's prior ruling or provided a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been earlier brought to the Court's attention.

---

[1] All docket references herein are made to *In re Grossman*, 10-19817-MLB (Bankr. W.D. Wash. filed Aug. 19, 2010).

[2] The Court construes the instant Motion for Reconsideration to have arisen under FRBP 9023. To the extent it could have been construed as a motion under FRBP 9024, the analysis set forth herein is equally applicable.

NOW, THEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, Debtor's Motion for Reconsideration is DENIED.

/// END OF ORDER ///